Appl. No. 10/815,508
Amdt. Dated 11/04/2005
Reply to Office action of 8/11/2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the previous Office Action, and for the citation of references, which have been studied with interest and care.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 11, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Reconsideration in light of the remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,411,452 issued to Cloke (hereinafter Cloke) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,652 issued to Rezzi et al. (hereinafter Rezzi).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's § 103 obviousness rejections in their entirety in light of the following remarks. As stated in MPEP § 2141.03:

> A prima facie obviousness rejection requires the three basic criteria be met. First, there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation, either in the references of themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the references. Second, there must be some reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, _must teach all the claim limitations._ The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, _and not based on the Applicant's disclosure._ MPEP §2141.03. (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie obviousness rejection has not been properly made by the Office Action because the combination of Cloke and Rezzi does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of Applicant's independent claims 1, 9, and 16.

For example, independent claims 1 and 16 recite claim limitations related to: a second detection mode...in which the synch mark detection circuit detects a servo synchronization signal based on the head reading a SSM and a wedge identifier (ID) of a servo header of an

Docket No: K35A1431
005575.P031

Page 7 of 10

ETK/tn

embedded servo wedge...*the wedge ID being utilized in conjunction with the SSM to validate the servo synchronization signal.*

Similarly, independent claim 9 recites claim limitations related to: detecting a servo synchronization signal in a second mode based on the head reading a first SSM and a first wedge identifier (ID) of a first servo header of an embedded servo wedge...*the first wedge ID being utilized in conjunction with the first SSM to validate the servo synchronization signal...*

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office Action states that although Cloke fails to disclose: wherein the synch mark detection circuit detects a servo synchronization signal based on the head reading a SSM and a wedge ID (or sector ID) of a servo header of an embedded servo wedge...the wedge ID being utilized in conjunction with the SSM to validate the servo synchronization; that this claim limitation is disclosed in Rezzi. In support of this, the Office action cites Figure 1 and reference numerals 12, 14, 16, 18.

The Office Action also cites column 4, lines 45-51 of Rezzi, which states:

> The encoded servo information signal may be detected by passing said encoded servo information through a Viterbi detector that has been modified to eliminate state changes that would be caused by the prohibited adjacent data state combinations. The act of encoding may be performed by encoding the Gray code using a 4:12 run-length code that satisfies a constraint wherein a number of 0's in a row cannot be more than 10 and less than 2. (Rezzi, column 4, lines 45-51).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has misconstrued the teachings of Rezzi and that Rezzi does not in fact teach or suggest these claim limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does Rezzi teach or suggest *utilizing a wedge ID in conjunction with an SSM to validate a servo synchronization signal.*

As set forth in Rezzi, a servo synchronization mark (SSM) is used to mark the beginning of the Gray code field, and a bit by bit correlator is used to identify the SSM in order to begin the decoding of the Gray code...Typically, the SSM presents a reserved word 3 bytes in length that complies with certain code constraints...(Rezzi, column 5, lines 42-47).

More particularly, as set forth in Rezzi:

Appl. No. 10/815,508
Amdt. Dated 11/04/2005
Reply to Office action of 8/11/2005

      The output from the modified servo Viterbi detector 38 is connected to a
12:4 detector 50, which provides an output on a nonreturn to zero (NRZ) encoded
line 52. The output from the modified servo Viterbi detector 38 is additionally
connected to the input of a servo sync mark detector 54, which provides a Sync
Byte Detect (SBD) output 56, as well as an input to a servo sequencer
58...(column 6, line 64 – column 7, line 3)

Applicant respectfully submits that Rezzi does not teach or suggest *utilizing a wedge ID*
in conjunction with a SSM to validate the servo synchronization signal, as set forth in
Applicant's claim limitations. Instead, Rezzi uses an SSM detector 54 to detect an SSM, by
itself, in order to validate a servo synchronization signal referred to as the Sync Byte Detect
(SBD) output 56. Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Rezzi of *utilizing a wedge ID*
in conjunction with a SSM to validate the servo synchronization signal.

It is clear from the teachings of Rezzi that the SSM by itself (as detected by the SSM
detector 54) is used to mark the beginning of the Gray code encoded data, which includes the
sector ID 18 and the track ID 20, such that the sector ID 18 and track ID 20 are read by the 12:4
decoder 50 to decode the encoded Gray coded sector ID and track ID. In this way, as set forth in
the Field of the Invention: "improvements in methods for the detection of track and sector
identification information in a Gray code containing field of a servo sector..." are provided.

Thus, as described above, Rezzi does not teach or suggest *the use of a wedge ID being*
utilized in conjunction with an SSM to validate a servo synchronization signal.

Accordingly, the combination of Cloke and Rezzi does not teach or suggest the claim
limitations of Applicant's independent claims 1, 9, and 16.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that independent claims 1, 9, and 16 be
allowed and passed to issuance. Further, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims that
depend therefrom also be allowed and passed to issuance.

Appl. No. 10/815,508
Amdt. Dated 11/04/2005
Reply to Office action of 8/11/2005

Conclusion

In view of the remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-23 define the subject invention over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 4, 2005   By

Eric T King
Reg. No. 44,188
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING   **FACSIMILE**

☐ *deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.*

☑ *transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.*

Date: 11/04/2005

Tu Nguyen

11/04/2005

Date

Docket No: K35A1431
005575.P031

Page 10 of 10

ETK/tn